

REMARKS

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities, and such informalities have been corrected. The continuing data is believed to be correct, so no changes have been made. Applicant requests that the Examiner be more specific regarding what about the continuing data is not updated.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not being enabling. Applicant has included an information piece that describes one type of impact-modified acrylic (polymethyl methacrylate) polymer sheet that can be used in the present invention. In short, as the information pieces presents data, UV light can pass through the sheet and then UV light is trapped therein. Spelling errors have been corrected, and "TM" for trademark has been inserted throughout the specification. Language has also been amended so that the claims are in concert with the specification per enablement.

Claims 2, 3, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The "of 16 wt" language has been removed from the claims, and claim 4 has been canceled.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr, Jr. et al. (4,095,115) in view of either Zimek et al. (5,397,444) or Crosbie (6,165,423). Applicant, respectfully, does not see any teaching or suggestion or motivation in the art cited to use a plate that allows UV light to pass within it but then traps UV light; and more particularly, to encourage a reaction that will destroy organic compounds in volatile organic compound laden waste water management.

Truly, if the present invention were obvious, then we would see a similar product to the present invention being employed to clean the volatile organic compound laden waste water resulting from the Tsunami disaster in Asia. However, all that is used is filters, which do not eradicate compounds, ***but merely filter them.*** Similarly, if the present invention were so obvious, then we would see a similar product to the present invention being employed to clean the volatile organic compound laden waste water resulting from the hurricane disasters in New Orleans and surrounding areas in the Gulf. However, all that is used is filters, which do not eradicate compounds, ***but merely filter them. Filtering still means that the volatile organic compounds must be disposed of, whereas the present invention eradicates the volatile organic compounds.*** The present invention is designed to solve a problem in a unique way – that is, the present invention offers a structure to destroy organic compounds in volatile organic compound laden waste water.

Again, is there no truer test of obviousness then the lack of any product to clean the volatile organic compound laden waste water, as does the present invention, when there is such a dire need for such a product? Applicant kindly submits that the present invention has a structure that enables eradication of the volatile organic compounds, and that if the present invention were so obvious, then there would have been a similar product to the present invention used in the aforementioned disasters.

However, there was no similar product used during the conditions that beckoned for it. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Please charge all fees due and owing to Deposit Account No. 500356 in the name of A Plus Legal Services – Greenberg & Lieberman. A petition of time is hereby made.

*I hereby certify that this was originally deposited via US first class mail prepaid
on October 6, 2005, to*

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of connected loops and a final upward stroke, identifying Michael L. Greenberg.

Michael L. Greenberg

47312